



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,202	10/13/2005	Johannes Boppel	W1.2106 PCT-US	1270
7590 Douglas R Hanscom Jones Tullar & Cooper Eads Station PO Box 2266 Arlington, VA 22202				
12/27/2007				
EXAMINER				
BANH, DAVID H				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
4193				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/27/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/553,202

Applicant(s)

BOPPEL ET AL.

Examiner

David H. Banh

Art Unit

4193

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 24-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 October 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE-08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/13/2005
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

/DANIEL PAN/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 4193DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Claim 25 recites a "position-controlled distinctive electric drive mechanism" for each of the roll changers. The specification fails to provide proper antecedent basis for said drive mechanism. Claim 34 recites a "web changer" intermediate first and seconds printing units and a re-reeling device. The specification provides no antecedent basis for said web changer. However, the specification recites a "web dryer" intermediate first and second printing units. Applicant may have intended to use the recitation "web dryer" in the claim language.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 24 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woessner (US Patent 3,948,504) in view of Wojewoda (US Patent 6,551,685) and Niedermeyer (US Patent 6,375,605).

For claim 24: Woessner teaches a method for producing a printed product (column 2, lines 37-38) including unrolling a first web of material from a first roll (column 2, line 30), imprinting said first roll of material (column 2, lines 32, 37-38) and winding said first imprinted roll into a first imprinted web at a first roll speed (column 2, lines 38-39). The method taught in Woessner also includes providing a second imprinted web roll (column 2, lines 30, 37-38), providing a superstructure (column 2, line 47) including a web separating means (column 2, line 61) and a turning bar arrangement (column 3, lines 6, 38-39), bringing the first and second webs to the superstructure (column 2, lines 46-48), separating each of said first and second webs into several partial webs (column 3, line 1), mixing said partial webs (column 1, lines 2-3), longitudinally folding said partial webs (column 6, lines 37-38) and transversely cutting the mixed partial webs (column 6, lines 45-46). Woessner teaches the performance of the unwinding, separating, mixing, folding and cutting of the first and second imprinted webs in a separate apparatus, thus with a second speed, the first speed being greater than the second speed.

Woessner fails to teach the unwinding of a second imprinted web. However, Wojewoda teaches the unwinding of the first and second imprinted webs from the first and second web rolls (column 3, line 55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method in Woessner to include the unrolling of the first and second webs as taught by Wojewoda for the purpose of improving the quality of cuts and perforations imposed on the webs thereafter.

Woessner also fails to teach the transverse folding of the mixed partial webs and the performance process of unwinding, separating, mixing, folding, cutting the first and second webs at a second speed slower than the first speed. However, Niedermeyer teaches a method for transversely folding a web material (column 1, lines 10-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine a method of transverse folding taught by Niedermeyer with the method in Woessner in view of Wojewoda for the purpose of producing folded printed products such as newspapers.

For claim 27 and 28: The above combination of Woessner, Wojewoda and Niedermeyer teach all of limitations of claims 27 and 28. Woessner teaches the slitting of either the first or second imprinted web into a plurality of partial webs (column 6, line 36-38).

4. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartmann (US Patent 6,360,665) in view of Lehrieder (US Patent 7,243,827B2) and in view of Cote (US Patent 6,705,982B1).

Hartmann teaches a processing device of a web-fed printing press (column 1, lines 34-35) comprising at least first and second roll changers adapted to unwind imprinted webs of material (column 2, lines 8-9), a draw-in unit for each roll changer (column 2, line 11), a longitudinal web cutting device arranged after the draw-in unit (column 2, lines 23-24), a turning bar arrangement after said longitudinal web cutting device (column 2, lines 13, 34). Hartmann fails to teach a separate position-controlled electric drive mechanism for each roll changer, a control device adapted to control said electric drive mechanism.

Lehrieder teaches a position controlled electric drive mechanism with a control device adapted to control the drive mechanism. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the electric drive mechanism and adapted control device as taught by Lehrieder to the teachings of Hartmann for the purpose of controlling more precisely the speed of the roll changers to match the draw-in units.

Hartmann fails to teach at least one former, one transverse cutting device and one transverse folder adapted to produce a printed product. However, Cote teaches a plurality of formers, a cutting device and a folder to produce a printed product from a web of material (column 6, lines 22-28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the device Cote with the printing press taught in Hartmann for the purpose of collating printed webs of materials from the press taught in Hartman to finalize more accurately the printed products.

5. Claims 26, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saupe (US Patent 7,243,602B2) in view of Michalik (US Patent 6,338,707B1).

For claim 26: Saupe teaches a web-fed rotary printing press including a first roll changer (paragraph 14, lines 1-2), a first roll changer (paragraph 14, lines 2-3), first and second printing units (paragraph 14, line 3) and a re-reeling device (paragraph 14, lines 7-8). It teaches a further processing device (paragraph 17, line 2), a second roll changer (paragraph 17, line 3), a superstructure (figure 1, label 7) and a transverse folder (paragraph 17, line 3). The printing press and

processing unit are taught to be housed together (paragraph 15, lines 2-4). Saupe does not teach a longitudinal fold former. However, Michalik teaches a longitudinal fold former within a printing press (column 1, lines 6-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify Saupe for including the longitudinal fold former taught by Michalik with the printing press for the purpose of producing a longitudinally and transversely folded product such as a newspaper.

For claim 32: Claim 32 further recites the limitation of arranging the web-fed rotary printing press and the processing unit side-by-side. However, Saupe depicts the arrangement of the web-fed rotary printing press and the processing unit as side-by-side (Fig. 1).

For claim 33: Claim 33 further recites the limitation that the first and second web running directions for the first and second roll changers are parallel. Saupe teaches the arrangement of the roll changers as parallel (Fig. 1).

6. Claims 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woessner (US Patent 3,948,504), Wojewoda (US Patent 6,551,685) and Niedermeyer (US Patent 6,375,705) as applied to claims 27 and 28 above, and further in view of Izawa (US Patent 6,821,038B2).

For claim 29: The combination of Woessner, Wojewoda and Niedermeyer teaches all of the limitations of claim 29 as found in claim 27. The combination does not teach that the first and second partial webs have a width of two pages. However, Izawa teaches the slitting of a web to provide a first and second partial web with a width of two pages (column 4, lines 41-43). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art modify the combination of Woessner, Wojewoda and Niedermeyer with the teachings of Izawa for the purpose of providing the ability to produce partial webs with widths of two pages because such a partial web is especially suited for collating into a book or newspaper.

For claim 30: The combination of Woessner, Wojewoda and Nied does not teach that said partial webs have a width of two pages. However, Izawa teaches that partial webs may be cut to have a length of two pages (column 4, lines 41-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Woessner, Wojewoda and Niedermeyer for the purpose of providing the ability to produce multiple pages such as partial webs of two-pages.

For claim 31: The combination of Woessner, Wojewoda, Niedermeyer and Izawa teaches all of the limitations of claim 31 as found in claim 29 above. The combination does not teach that the pages are a newspaper page; however, Izawa teaches that the pages are newspaper pages (column 4, line 47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use newspaper pages as taught in Izawa for the purpose of reducing the cost of a producing numerous large printed products.

7. Claims 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saupe (US Patent 7,243,602B2) and Michalik (US Patent 6,338,707B1) as applied to claim 26 above, and further in view of DeVroome (US PG Pub 2002/0107123A1).

The combination of Saupe and Michalik teach all of the elements of claims 34 and 35 as found in claim 26. The combination does not teach a web changer intermediate the first and second printing units and a re-reeling device and a cooling roller arrangement between the first and second printing units and a re-reeling device. However, DeVroome teaches a web changer and a cooling roller arrangement between the first and second printing units and the re-reeling device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the web changer and cooling roller of DeVroome into the teachings of Saupe and Michalik for the purpose of drying the printed ink and cooling the heat dried web before re-reeling it.

8. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartmann (US Patent 6,360,665), Lehrieder (US Patent 7,243,827B2) and Cote (US Patent 6,705,982B1) as applied to claim 25 above, and further in view of Dufour (US Patent 6,298,781B1) and Herbert (US Patent 6,886,823B2).

The combination of Hartmann, Lehrieder and Cote teaches all of the limitations of claim 36 as found in claim 25. The combination does not teach at least a first former centered on an uncut web. However, Dufour teaches a former centered on a partial web. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to combine the former centered on a part of Dufour with the combination of Hartmann, Lehrieder and Cote for the purpose of better holding the partial web in place.

The combination does not teach a second former centered on a partial web. However, Herbert teaches a second former centered on a partial web. It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Herbert with that of Woessner, Wojewoda and Niedermeyer for the purpose of better holding the partial web in place.

9. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woessner (US Patent 3,948,504), Wojewoda (US Patent 6,551,685) and Niedermeyer (US Patent 6,375,705) as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Taniguchi (US Patent 5,735,203).

The combination of Woessner, Wojewoda and Niedermeyer teaches all of the limitations of claim 37 as found in claim 24. The combination does not teach that the first web speed is at least 30% greater than the second web speed.

However, Taniguchi teaches that the first web speed is at least 30% greater than the second web speed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Taniguchi to the combination of Woessner, Wojewoda and Niedermeyer for the purpose of providing correlation of the amount of printed product in each apparatus.

10. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woessner (US Patent 3,948,504), Wojewoda (US Patent 6,551,685) and Niedermeyer (US Patent 6,375,705) as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Leyva (US PG Pub 2002/0181002A1).

The combination of Woessner, Wojewoda and Niedermeyer teaches all of the limitations of claim 38 as found in claim 24. The combination does not teach the limitation of selecting the first web speed as a maximum production speed.

However, Leyva teaches the election of the first web speed as a maximum

production speed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to combine election of the first web speed as a maximum as taught in Leyva with the combination for the purpose of recognizing a maximum speed for the printing press to determine the production capabilities.

11. Claims 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woessner (US Patent 3,948,504), Wojewoda (US Patent 6,551,685) and Niedermeyer (US Patent 6,375,705) as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Walczak (US PG Pub 2002/0078839A1).

For claim 39: The combination of Woessner, Wojewoda and Niedermeyer teaches all of the limitations of claim 39 as found in claim 24. The combination does not teach the use of a 16-page printing press as claimed. However, Walczak teaches that the use of a 16-page press is generally known in the art (paragraph 3, lines 3-4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to implement the 16-page printing press disclosed in Walczak in the combination of Woessner, Wojewoda and Niedermeyer for the purpose of more readily being able to print newspapers and other publications.

For claim 40: The combination of Woessner, Wojewoda and Niedermeyer teaches all of the limitations of claim 40 as found in claim 24. The combination does not teach a method of producing a 32 page product. However, Walczak teaches a method of producing a 32 page product by running the 16-page printing press twice. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to add the step taught in Walczak for the

purpose of producing a 32-page printed product for use in production of a newspaper.

12. Claims 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartmann (US Patent 6,360,665), Lehrieder (US Patent 7,243,827B2) and Cote (US Patent 6,705,982B1) as applied to claim 25 above, and further in view of Walczak (US PG Pub 2002/0078839A1).

For claim 41: The combination of Hartmann, Lehrieder and Cote teaches all of the limitations of claim 40 as found in claim 25. The combination does not teach the use of a 16-page printing press as claimed. However, Walczak teaches that the use of a 16-page press is generally known in the art (paragraph 3, lines 3-4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the 16-page printing press disclosed in Walczak in the combination of Hartmann, Lehrieder and Cote for the purpose of being able to more readily print newspapers and other larger publications.

The combination of Hartmann, Lehrieder and Cote teaches all of the limitations in claim 42 as found in claim 25. The combination does not the production of a printed product of 32 pages. However, Walczak teaches the production of a 32 page product from running the printing press for 16 pages twice (paragraph 3, lines 3-4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to add the limitation of producing a 32 page printed product as taught by Walczak for the purpose of using said product in the production of a newspaper.

Art Unit: 4193

13. Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartmann (US Patent 6,360,665), Lehrieder (US Patent 7,243,827B2) and Cote (US Patent 6,705,982B1) as applied to claim 25 above, and further in view of Vestman (US Patent 6,109,182).

The combination of Hartmann, Lehrieder and Cote teaches all of the limitations of claim 43 as found in claim 25. The combination does not teach that the does not printing press is a job printing press. However, Vestman teaches a jobbing printing press (figure 3a and 3b). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to utilize a jobbing printing press within the frame of Hartmann, Lehrieder and Cote for the purpose of cost effectively duplicating products.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID H. BANH whose telephone number is (571)270-3851. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30AM-5PM Alt. Fri 7:30AM-4PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long T. Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-1753. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DHB

/DANIEL PAN/
Primary Examiner